

1973

A study of certain attitudinal and biographical characteristics of upper echelon administrators in the Virginia community college system

Paul St. Clair Hurd
College of William & Mary - School of Education

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wm.edu/etd>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hurd, Paul St. Clair, "A study of certain attitudinal and biographical characteristics of upper echelon administrators in the Virginia community college system" (1973). *Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects*. Paper 1539618322.

<https://dx.doi.org/doi:10.25774/w4-1gvd-jf14>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, & Master Projects at W&M ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects by an authorized administrator of W&M ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@wm.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

74-84

HURD, Paul St. Clair, 1936-
A STUDY OF CERTAIN ATTITUDINAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL
CHARACTERISTICS OF UPPER ECHELON ADMINISTRATORS
IN THE VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM.

The College of William and Mary in Virginia,
Ed.D., 1973
Education, higher

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

A STUDY OF CERTAIN ATTITUDINAL AND
BIOGRAPHICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF
UPPER ECHELON ADMINISTRATORS
IN THE VIRGINIA COMMUNITY
COLLEGE SYSTEM

A Dissertation
Presented to the
Faculty of the School of Education
The College of William and Mary in Virginia

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by
Paul S. Hurd
August, 1973

APPROVAL SHEET

We the undersigned do certify that we have read this dissertation and that in our individual opinions it is acceptable in both scope and quality as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Accepted August 1973 by

Fred L. Adair

Fred L. Adair, Ph. D.

Daniel R. Gerber

Daniel R. Gerber, Ph.D.

John F. Lavach

John F. Lavach, Ed. D.
Chairman of Doctoral Committee

Dedication

To Mike, Lori, Jeff, and Tim, who have endured much during their father's quest for learning, but who, whether they realize it or not, are the reason for it all.

Table of Contents

	Page
Dedication	iii
List of Tables	vi
 Chapter	
1. Introduction and Statement of the Problem	1
Hypotheses and Definitions	3
Summary	4
2. Survey of Related Literature	5
The Administrative Function in Higher	
Education	5
Dogmatism and Authoritarianism as	
Personality Variables	9
Relationships Between Dogmatism and	
Biographical Factors	13
Biographical Information Relative to	
Community College Administrators	16
Relationships Between Authoritarianism-	
Dogmatism, Teaching, Student Services,	
and Leadership	18
3. Data and Conclusions	22
Population	22
Procedure	22
Presentation of Data	23
Biographical Profiles	24

Chapter	Page
Relationships Between Dogmatism and	
Biographical Factors	24
Age	24
Sibling Relationships	26
Parental Occupation	26
Parental Education	34
Subject's Undergraduate Major Field	34
Subject's Masters Degree Field	37
Subject's Doctoral Field	37
Subject's Undergraduate Grade Average	37
Subject's Military Service	38
Subject's Military Rank	38
Subject's Religious Affiliation	38
Subject's Position	43
4. Conclusions and Recommendations	48
Conclusions	48
Hypothesis I	49
Hypothesis II	50
Hypotheses III and IV	50
Summary	50
Recommendations for Future Research	51
Appendices	54
References	84

List of Tables

Table	Page
1. General Data	25
2. Age Versus Dogmatism Score	27
3. Number of Male Siblings Versus Dogmatism Score	28
4. Number of Female Siblings Versus Dogmatism Score	29
5. Number of Older Male Siblings Versus Dogmatism Score	30
6. Number of Older Female Siblings Versus Dogmatism Score	31
7. Maternal Occupation Versus Dogmatism Score	32
8. Paternal Occupation Versus Dogmatism Score	33
9. Paternal Education Versus Dogmatism Score	35
10. Maternal Education Versus Dogmatism Score	36
11. Subject's Military Service Versus Dogmatism Score	39
12. Subject's Military Rank Versus Dogmatism Score	40
13. Subject's Religious Affiliation Versus Dogmatism Score	41
14. Subject's Perceived Strength of Religious Affiliation Versus Dogmatism Score	42
15. Subject's Reported Means of Religious Affiliation Versus Dogmatism Score	44
16. Subject's Position Versus Dogmatism Score	45
17. Subject's Dogmatism Score Versus Position	46

Table	Page
18. Subject's Dogmatism Score Versus Position	47

A STUDY OF CERTAIN ATTITUDINAL AND
BIOGRAPHICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF
UPPER ECHELON ADMINISTRATORS
IN THE VIRGINIA COMMUNITY
COLLEGE SYSTEM

Chapter 1

Introduction and Statement of the Problem

In recent years numerous efforts taking a variety of forms have been made with the intent of establishing systematic approaches to the art of administering institutions of higher learning. As Richardson (1970) suggests, "current practice represents a hodgepodge of ideas garnered from business, secondary schools, and four-year universities. . . [p. 16]." Invariably these efforts have suggested that it is the administrator himself, his attitudes, perceptions, and predispositions which must ultimately provide the basis upon which any methodology of administration is founded. This methodology, or administrative style, is, according to Demerath, Stephens, and Taylor (1967), a sociological phenomenon involving "qualities of human relations, types of power, kinds of skills, methods of making decisions and gaining compliance [pp. 127-128]."

Unlike the evolution of the various types of public and private senior institutions over a long period of time, the concept of the two-year comprehensive community college has been developed over a comparatively brief period, and in recent years with at least a degree of systematization. The administration of such institutions has received consequently only a modicum of attention. Numerous studies of methods of community college administration at the presidential, dean of instruction, and dean of student services levels have been undertaken, with the majority directed toward a description of the

duties and operational activities of the individual administrator. Examples of such studies are those of Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson (1955, p. 187), Latta and Hartung (1970), and O'Bannion, Thurston, and Gulden (1970). Few studies have been presented which pertain to administrative attitudes, especially in terms of relationships between those attitudes and either administrative biographical data or the system in which the administrator functions. Some of the studies which have attempted to do so are those of Gordon (1970), Long (1971), and Piters (1971).

The personality variables of authoritarianism and dogmatism have been demonstrated to be of no small importance in relationship to certain facets of administrative operation. For example, Vacchiano, Strauss, and Hochman (1969), in relating these variables, stated that reliance on authority by highly dogmatic subjects has been established in such diverse areas as counselor training, learning, evaluation of political statements, acceptance of an official policy, interpretation of the cause of a social demonstration, and in the perceived coercive force of authority figures, all of which can be readily construed as potential aspects of the administrative function. Furthermore, these same authors suggest that evidence is available relative to the existence of a negative correlation between an individual's dogmatism and his tolerance, flexibility, and security. Once again, these variables can be shown to be related to the function of the administrator, as are the characteristics of immaturity, impulsiveness, defensiveness, and stereotypical thought--all of which have been shown to be tended

toward by highly dogmatic subjects (Plant, Telford, and Thomas, 1965).

Research has been conducted which attempted to relate dogmatism or other related factors, such as rigidity, to biographical information, with inconclusive results. Several such studies will be cited in Chapter 2 as will other studies describing biographical characteristics of community college administrators.

This study was performed for the purpose of determining the degree of dogmatism which characterizes each of the various types of upper echelon administrators in the employment of the Virginia Community College System and to determine any existing relationships between that variable and certain selected biographical data. Upper echelon administrators, as defined for this study, included all presidents, provosts, deans of instruction, and deans of student services in the colleges comprising the Virginia Community College System.

Hypotheses and Definitions

For the purposes of this study, the degree of open- or closed-mindedness was defined according to the adjusted score achieved by a subject on the "Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, Short Form E" (see Appendix A). In order to facilitate statistical analysis through the elimination of negative scores, 160 points, or four points per item, was added to the raw score achieved on the Dogmatism scale by each subject. The resultant value, raw score plus 160, was thus accepted as the adjusted score.

In order to determine the nature and source of the degree of dogmatism possessed by the various upper echelon administrators within

the institutions comprising the Virginia Community College System, the following hypotheses were tested:

a. The degree of open- or closed-mindedness demonstrated by upper echelon administrators in the Virginia Community College System is not related to various socioeconomic and educational factors.

b. Upper echelon administrators in the Virginia Community College System do not exhibit a generally closed-minded attitude.

c. Presidents in that system do not exhibit a greater degree of closed-mindedness than either deans of instruction or deans of student services.

d. Deans of instruction do not exhibit a greater degree of closed-mindedness than deans of student services.

Summary

Within this chapter has been an attempt to present the rationale underlying this study of the backgrounds and attitudes of certain administrators in the Virginia Community College System. The following chapters will present a survey of related research, the data gathered in this research, the conclusions drawn from this research, and recommendations for subsequent related research efforts.

Chapter 2

Survey of Related Literature

In attempting to describe the characteristics of any group of community junior college administrators, it is necessary to specify certain areas of consideration. Therefore, the following survey of the literature was subdivided into five broad areas: (a) the administrative function in higher education; (b) dogmatism and authoritarianism as personality variables; (c) relationships between dogmatism and biographical factors; (d) biographical information relative to college administrators; and (e) relationships between dogmatism and teaching, student services, and leadership.

The Administrative Function in

Higher Education

The evolution of the various types of modern institutions of higher education has been accompanied by a comparable evolution in the administrative area. Demerath, Stephens, and Taylor (1967) suggested that this evolutionary process has reached the point where the modern institution of higher education is indeed a "managed organization [p. 16]" with the implication that administrators of such organizations are managers, and as such must apply management principles in the performance of their functions.

More directly related to the community junior colleges, Thornton (1960, p. 115) stated that the function of the college requires leadership, planning, coordination, housekeeping,

supervision, and evaluation by the administrative staff. Duryea (1962, pp. 41-42) suggested that the administrator has two responsibilities--the efficient, effective handling of routine affairs, and the exercise of creative educational leadership. Hungate (1964, pp. 67-71), in a manner similar to Millett (1962, pp. 20-21) and Masterson (1960, p. 21), described four major areas of management responsibility: (a) delegation and organizing, (b) direction, (c) operation, and (d) evaluation.

Hemphill (1955) studied two dimensions of leadership behavior, consideration and initiating structure. The first of these dimensions involves an interest in the personal needs of group members, even while taking initiative for getting work done. The second dimension involves behavior directed toward goal clarification, organization for task clarification, and an emphasis on standards of production.

Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson (1955, pp. 168-170) described two points of view for community junior college organizational analysis, the rational model and the natural system model. They suggested that the administrative style utilized "will depend heavily upon which position is given greatest value." Extending this approach, administration is defined as "the direction and coordination of these two components [Getzel's nomothetic and ideographic components] of the organization [p. 172]."

Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson developed a list of 15 administrative skills required of the effective community junior college administrator. They are:

- a. decision-making, based in a broad background;
- b. coordination;
- c. change agent;
- d. awareness and appraisal of faculty and staff roles;
- e. delegation of responsibility;
- f. who to involve;
- g. insight;
- h. discussion leading, response elicitation, point summarization;
- i. awareness of environmental power structure;
- j. communications;
- k. willingness and desire to join with others in self-appraisal relative to the quality of leadership;
- l. continuous self-analysis;
- m. consistency;
- n. ability to predict the reactions of faculty, staff, students, and community; and
- o. sensitivity to organizational structure (p. 187).

Inasmuch as the case for considering college administration as a form of organizational management has been reasonably well established in such sources as Demerath, Stephens, and Taylor (1967), it is appropriate that the management theories proposed by McGregor (1960, pp. 33-34) be considered. In proposing Theory X and Theory Y, McGregor suggested that the application of the former involves the following assumptions:

- a. the human being innately dislikes and avoids work;

b. as a result of that dislike and avoidance, coercion is required in order to achieve tasks; and

c. the human prefers to be directed, lacks ambition, and desires security.

Theory Y, on the other hand, involves a series of assumptions which are antithetical to those of Theory X. They are:

a. the human does not dislike work, and indeed may be satisfied by it;

b. coercion is not the only means for achieving an effort toward attaining organizational goals; in fact, if allowed to do so, man will direct himself;

c. commitment is a function of rewards;

d. the human learns to accept and even to seek authority under proper conditions;

e. imagination, ingenuity, and creativity are widespread in the population; and

f. the intellectual potential of the average human is only partly utilized in modern industry.

Likert (1967, pp. 13-46) suggested that under Theory X management, the chain of command results in increased detail and restrictions as directives are passed down. Furthermore, he suggested that authoritative management often causes the issuance of unconditional orders to management representatives.

Returning to the area of academic administration, Wilson (1955) suggested that extreme authoritarianism cannot be maintained at the larger and better colleges and universities, but is common in

small, mediocre, and insecure institutions. In such settings there is a tendency for an administrator to surround himself with an air of infallibility.

Gould (1964, pp. 43-44) similarly stated that it is a rare situation which allows an autocratic or authoritarian dean. In fact, there exists a strong tendency toward the democratic end of the scale, with the autocratic dean being characterized as a "troublemaker."

Although it is apparent from the preceding that the authoritarian approach to administration is generally held to be undesirable, from both management and educational points of view, it is worthy of note that Cohen and Brawer (1972) have stated that "teaching as a profession attracts and holds people with authoritarian tendencies [p. 37]." This is of particular interest in view of the apparent tendency for members of teaching faculties to aspire to administrative positions.

Dogmatism and Authoritarianism as Personality Variables

That personality, in general, is a factor in the selection of an occupation has been suggested by various writers, among them Cronbach (1970), who states that "Personality, as commonly measured, probably has much to do with the sort of work and personal relations a person seeks . . . [p. 548]." Cronbach suggests, however, that personality has "but little to do with his ability to perform a role when he is thrust into it [p. 548]."

The concept of an authoritarian personality was described by Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson, and Sanford (1950) as being

conventional, cynical, destructive, aggressive, power-centered, and ethnocentric. Extending this concept, Rokeach (1960) investigated what he described as open-closed systems, with the dogmatic personality described as being at the closed end of an open-closed, belief-disbelief system. The closed belief-disbelief system was defined as one that provided "a cognitive framework for rationalizing and justifying egocentric self-righteousness and the moral condemnation of others [p. 69]."

Kerlinger (1964, pp. 673-674) used a study by Rokeach and Fruchter as an example of the research procedure known as factor analysis. That study (Rokeach & Fruchter, 1956) attempted to determine whether or not dogmatism can be discriminated from authoritarianism, ethnocentrism, and rigidity, with the result that such discrimination was confirmed. In the study it was noted that dogmatism is related to anxiety, paranoia, and self-rejection, but even more strongly to authoritarianism and rigidity. M. T. Mednick and S. A. Mednick (1964, p. 476) also noted the relationship between dogmatism and authoritarianism when they reported a correlation of .67 between Rokeach D scale scores and scores on the California F scale devised by Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson, and Sanford.

For the purpose of comparison it should be noted that the Rokeach D scale is a brief questionnaire of the Likert form which forces the subject to voice an opinion and which prevents neutrality on the part of the subject, in order to investigate the structure of beliefs, rather than their content. The F scale, published in 1950, was devised originally to measure indirectly prejudice and orientation

toward fascism through a similar format. As Byrne (1966a, p. 280) noted, one of the criticisms of studies of authoritarianism was related to a liberal bias on the part of those performing research in the field. The Rokeach instrument found its theoretical base in an attempt to eliminate liberal or conservative bias as a factor of influence.

Korn and Giddan (1964) concluded that the more dogmatic an individual is, the less tolerant, the less flexible, and the less secure he is. Furthermore, these same investigators found no relationship between dogmatism scores and intellectual aptitude.

Simons and Berkowitz (1969), in an investigation of the possibility that the Rokeach D scale was structured in such a manner as to include a leftist bias, concluded that no such bias existed. It is notable that the results of that study also were construed as further evidence of the construct validity of the Rokeach scale.

Plant, Telford, and Thomas (1965) characterized the highly dogmatic individual as psychologically immature, impulsive, defensive, and stereotyped in thinking, while the individual exhibiting low dogmatism tends to be outgoing, enterprising, calm, mature, forceful, efficient, clear thinking, responsible, and more likely to succeed in an academic setting (writer's emphasis).

The hypothesis that degree of dogmatism may be governed in part by locus of control was investigated by Clouser and Hjelle (1970). It was concluded in that study that externally-controlled subjects were significantly more dogmatic than those controlled internally. In addition, it was proposed that dogmatism may be a correlate of the

Rotter internal-external construct.

Hamilton (1971) compared the California Psychological Inventory, Rokeach D scale, Janis-Field Feelings of Inadequacy scale, Leary Interpersonal Check List, dominant-submissive self-ratings, and peer nominations as means of assessing self-esteem, dominance, and dogmatism. The conclusion was reached that there exists a high correlation between the four methods of assessing dominance.

Using the F scale, Gabennesch and Hunt (1971) investigated the relationship between accuracy of interpersonal perceptions and degree of authoritarianism. They concluded that greater accuracy of perception relative to others is demonstrated by low authoritarians.

The seven propositions involved in Rokeach's open-closed mind theory relative to beliefs regarding self and others were tested by Lee and Ehrlich (1971). In their investigation it was reported that the closed-minded person, as opposed to one who was open-minded, would be likely to:

- a. hold negative beliefs regarding self and others,
- b. hold contradictory self beliefs,
- c. engage in self-proselytization,
- d. seek status and power,
- e. report a sense of martyrdom, and
- f. display moral self-righteousness.

Using the Rokeach scale, Mouw (1969) investigated the effect of dogmatism on five levels of cognitive processes as described by Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Cognitive Domain. It was concluded that open-minded subjects tend to increase in task

performance as the task becomes more complex, while the opposite effect was noted to occur with closed-minded subjects. These results were construed as being supportive of the Rokeach idea that closed-minded persons rely on authority for direction and support more than those who are characterized as being open-minded.

Relationships Between Dogmatism
and Biographical Factors

Probably the most appropriate area in which to initiate a discussion of relationships between biographical factors and any personality variable is that of parental influence. Byrne (1966b), in a study of 108 college students and their parents, arrived at several noteworthy conclusions. First, it was found that a significantly greater tendency existed for low offspring authoritarianism when at least one parent demonstrated a low F score than when neither parent was low. In addition, the sex of the low F parent was not found to be significant.

However, it was also determined by the Byrne study that "the presence of a high F parent significantly affects authoritarianism in the offspring only if it is the same-sexed parent who is high . . . [p. 228]." This statement, in conjunction with the preceding paragraph, leads to the conclusion that high F offspring are most likely to result from families in which neither parent is low F or where the parent of the same sex is high F.

A recent study by Mikesell and Tesser (1971) compared the life histories of 719 male college freshmen with their degrees of authoritarianism, as indicated by F scores. It was found that a

significant correlation existed between F scores and idealized parental relations, athletic activity and interest, ideological intellectual independence, religious activity, and anomy.

Cuffee (1970) applied a scale measuring personality rigidity to 60 male and 60 female white, middle class teachers in an attempt to relate rigidity to chronological age. It was found that when the subjects were subdivided into three age groups (25 to 34, 35 to 44, and 45 to 54) a significant difference in rigidity existed between the age groups, with a positive correlation between chronological age and rigidity. It was further concluded that no significant difference existed between the sexes, and that no significant age-sex interaction was present.

The possibility of a relationship between religion and dogmatism was investigated by Kilpatrick, L. W. Sutker, and P. B. Sutker (1970). They administered the Rokeach scale to 245 male and 250 female southern undergraduate students, comprised of Roman Catholics, Protestants, Jews, and nonchurchgoers, together with a question pertaining to the average monthly church attendance of the individuals. It was found that churchgoers were generally more dogmatic than nonchurchgoers. Roman Catholics and nonchurchgoers were found to be less dogmatic than Jews and Protestants. However, this study also concluded that speculations regarding the relative dogmatism of religious groups are inappropriate.

The results of a study by Dressel and Lehmann (1968) suggested that male undergraduates are significantly more stereotypic, dogmatic, and unreceptive to new ideas than are females. Males also

tend to be more oriented toward traditional values. The study also concludes that Catholic students were most stereotypic and dogmatic and had the highest degree of traditional value orientation, while Jewish students demonstrated the least traditional value orientation. It was also found that the more fundamentalistic Protestants were significantly more stereotypic and dogmatic than other Protestants.

That same study found no significant difference in attitudes and values between students whose parents were native born and those whose parents were foreign born. Students from rural areas had higher traditional value orientations than those from urban areas, while students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds were shown to be more stereotypic and to have higher traditional value orientations than those from upper middle or upper social levels.

In addition, the Dressel and Lehmann study concluded that females majoring in nontechnical curricula were more stereotypic and dogmatic than those in vocationally-oriented programs, while males in the physical and biological sciences were less stereotypic in beliefs than were their counterparts in other fields. Students in general were found to become more flexible and less authoritarian from the freshman year to the senior year, although no significant relationship was found between length of college attendance and changes in dogmatism, receptivity to new ideas, or an attitude of open-mindedness. All groups moved toward a more open-minded and flexible attitude.

Finally, in comparing students attending three Midwestern colleges, no significant difference in dogmatism or traditional value orientation was observed. However, it was noted that a significant

difference did exist in stereotypic beliefs, with such beliefs more common at liberal arts colleges.

Wittmer and Webster (1969) found that experience as a teacher tended to result in significantly higher dogmatism scores by counselor trainees. It was also noted in this study that dogmatism increased with age and teaching experience.

Biographical Information Relative
to Community College
Administrators

Although the biographical data regarding community college presidents is scant, due to both the rapidity with which the community colleges have grown and to the fairly constant position changing which has occurred in those institutions, it is of interest to examine the data that does exist.

Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson (1955, pp. 183-185) examined the backgrounds of a group of community college presidents, and found that 46.2% had achieved their doctorate, 51.4% the masters degree, and 2.4% the baccalaureate. These degrees were primarily in the broad field of education. Of the presidents surveyed by Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson, 70.8% had come to their positions at the time of the survey from other administrative positions.

Cavanaugh (1971) examined six biographical items relative to a sample of community college presidents. These items were: (a) age, (b) sex, (c) race, (d) marital status, (e) city or town size in which the respondent spent the majority of his school years, and (f) highest earned degree. It was found by this study that 59.4% of the

presidents surveyed had entered the presidency from other junior college positions, 14% from four-year institutions, 14.6% from public schools, and 12% from other positions. Seven different career strategies were identified by the study, which also suggested several background and personal factors which were integrally related to strategy orientations.

Latta and Hartung (1970) characterized the typical community junior college academic dean as a family man in early middle age who had graduated from a university, possessed at least a Masters degree, and who had taught at several academic levels. This study suggested that two characteristics of an academic dean should be experience and flexibility.

In surveying 70 junior college chief administrators in 1966, Carmichael (1969) concluded that their family backgrounds indicated an upward mobility over two generations. In addition, he found a high degree of career mobility, as indicated by an average association with four institutions prior to the one in which the presidency was held at the time of the survey. This same study also found that the East North Central states and West North Central states provided most of the presidents surveyed, and that over half were located in states other than their state of birth.

The typical president of a community junior college in the Southeast was found by Moore (1971) to have had 22 years previous experience in education, to hold the doctorate in education, and to have previously held the position as dean or president. Typically, this man was born in 1922 and achieved his highest academic degree in

1958, at age 36. Most of the presidents responding to the Moore survey had assumed the presidency between 1958 and 1969, with a mean year of assumption of 1963.

Dahl (1970) found job satisfaction in the community junior college administrator to be high, with 80% of those contacted indicating that they perceived their roles as providing for innovative-type leadership. Most, however, felt that preparation for their roles was inadequate, and indicated a high level of personal involvement with their jobs.

Relationships Between

Authoritarianism-Dogmatism,

Teaching, Student Services,

and Leadership

As noted previously, certain writers have proposed that teaching attracts authoritarian individuals. Wees (1953) suggested five primary sources of authoritarianism in education: governmental tradition, as witnessed by repetitive use of the label "authorized"; the traditions of education itself, which has perennially used such extreme terms of authority as "master," "headmaster," "mistress," and "headmistress"; culture, which relies on the book as not only the word, but the last word; ego; and ignorance. Relative to this last source, Wees suggested that

Many school officials and a host of teachers simply do not know that a child never learns what a teacher teaches him, but rather that the child applies to the content of the teacher's presentation his own creative faculties and comes up with a

learning sequence which would amaze the teacher if she could only discover what the child has actually learned [p. 22].

Dandes (1966) found a significant relationship between measured psychological health and the specified attitudes and values of teachers. Scales of liberalism and permissiveness were positively related to psychological health, while authoritarianism and dogmatism were found to be negatively related to psychological health. Subject information or knowledge of teaching techniques were suggested to be inadequate in the insurance of teaching effectiveness; in fact, it was suggested that the teacher may possess all possible knowledge and still be unable to communicate in a psychologically healthy framework.

As part of a larger research project relative to the identification of variables which contribute to high performance by adult educators, Funk and Carter (1971) compared dogmatism scores and supervisor ratings of extension personnel. They found that degree of dogmatism and performance were negatively correlated, and that this correlation was affected by age and level of education, with a tendency for open-minded agents to be rated higher in performance.

Student personnel directors generally scored lower on the dogmatism scale than other groups in a study by Moreland (1971). In addition, it was found that dogmatism scores of these individuals did not differ significantly among types of institutions, enrollment sizes, age ranges of subjects, educational degree levels, or regional accreditation association in which the subjects' schools held membership. Females were found to be significantly lower in dogmatism

than males, Protestants significantly higher than Roman Catholics, and Protestants and Roman Catholics together higher than those who indicated a religious preference of "other."

Long (1971) administered an Academic Experience Inventory, the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, and the Hemphill-Coons Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire to the professional staffs in 10 Kansas junior colleges. It was found that it could not be concluded that types of academic preparation affect perceptions of leader behavior relative to either group maintenance or group achievement. By the same token, no conclusions could be drawn relative to either an affect by previous work experience on perceptions of leader behavior as related to group maintenance or group achievement or to any distinction in perception of these same leader behavior dimensions between presidents and other professionals.

In an investigation of relationships between dogmatism and communications in educational administrators, Piters (1971) subjected 270 teachers and 56 vice-principals and "others" to the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale and rated the administrators relative to communication behavior, using the Administrative Communications Rating Scale. It was found that highly dogmatic teachers tended to be significantly more critical of administrative communication behavior. Relative to the administrators themselves, it was found that their dogmatism, recency of training, and years spent in the school are not significantly related to the communications rating received by them.

In a similar study attempting to relate leader behavior, dogmatism, and philosophy, Gordon (1970) found the existence of a

significant negative relationship between dogmatism and the consideration dimension of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. Furthermore, it was noted that there existed a tendency for administrators who scored high, or traditional, on the Philosophy Scale to be perceived as less considerate than those scoring low. Finally, this same investigation established a high positive relationship between dogmatism and philosophy, i.e., high dogmatism correlated with high scores on the philosophy scale, and low dogmatism with low, or progressive, on the philosophy scale.

Using the F scale, Budner's scale for intolerance of ambiguities (IA), and a leadership preference scale, Bhushan (1970a) found a substantial negative correlation to exist between preference for democratic leadership and both authoritarianism and IA. In a separate study, the same investigator (1970b) extended this negative correlation to include neuroticism and a positive correlation between preference for democratic leadership and ascendance and extroversion. In addition, it was suggested that organismic variables, i.e., age, education, and residential background, are not related to leadership preference.

Chapter 3

Data and Conclusions

Population

The population examined in this study consisted of all upper echelon administrators in the Virginia Community College System. For the purposes of this study, the term upper echelon administrators was defined as all presidents, deans of instruction, provosts, and deans of student services. At the time when the research was conducted, the Virginia Community College System consisted of 22 institutions, each of which was entitled to have in its employ at least one person in each of these positions, with the exception of provost, which was permitted only in the case of multi-campus institutions, where the provost also functioned as dean of instruction.

Procedure

The name and title of each individual satisfying the preceding definition of the term upper echelon administrator was obtained from the Virginia Department of Community Colleges during the month of June, 1972. On June 30, 1972, a package containing a covering letter (Appendix B), a copy of a supporting memorandum from Dr. S. A. Burnette, Vice-Chancellor of the Virginia Community College System (Appendix C), and a copy of the "Attitudinal and Biographical Survey of Upper Echelon Administrators in the Virginia Community College System" devised for this study was mailed to each subject. Although it was originally intended to complete a follow-up mailing three

weeks after the original mailing, the initial response of 86.8% was deemed sufficiently high that a second mailing was unnecessary. Although respondents were requested to delete any identifying notations, return envelopes, many of which bore postmarks, were destroyed upon removal of their contents.

The first part of each questionnaire, the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, was scored by adding four points to each response in order to eliminate negative responses, after which the adjusted item scores were summed. A mean score and standard deviation were then calculated for each category of subjects and for the aggregate.

Part II of each questionnaire, the Biographical Survey, was coded in order to simplify tabulation, with each subject's responses extracted and tabulated according to category. Finally, a profile was determined for each group of subjects, together with chi-square values which were calculated in order to determine the degree of significance of relationships between biographical data and dogmatism scores relative to position. Appendix D indicates the classifications within and among which potential relationships were investigated.

Presentation of Data

In keeping with the twin purposes of this research, biographical study and examination of relationships between dogmatism and biographical factors, the data gathered will be presented in two parts. In the first of these segments a biographical profile will be drawn for each administrative classification, as well as a composite profile for the entire population. The second segment of the data

will be presented in the form of a series of cross-breaks relating dogmatism scores and biographical factors, using the chi-square technique as noted in the preceding section.

Prior to examining either of the two broad categories of data outlined above, however, it is necessary to examine certain general aspects of the research, including response percentage and mean dogmatism score for each administrative category and for the composite population. Table 1 indicates number of subjects, response frequency, percentage response, mean dogmatism score, and standard deviation of dogmatism scores.

Biographical Profiles

In the development of a profile of the typical Dean of Instruction, Dean of Student Services, or President, in the Virginia Community College System it was necessary to examine the responses of all subjects in each category. Mean values were determined for each response category through conversion of all responses to a numerical code. Appendix E indicates calculated mean scores for each biographical item.

Relationships Between Dogmatism and

Biographical Factors

Age

In order to ascertain the possible existence of significant relationships between age and dogmatism through use of the chi-square method it was necessary to artificially subdivide both age and dogmatism. Ages were partitioned according to whether subjects reported an age of less than 40 or greater than 39 years. Dogmatism

Table 1

General Data

Position	Number of subjects	Number respond- ing ^a	Percent respond- ing	Mean DS ^b	Standard deviation
Dean of Instruction	24	22	98.6	123.0	21.7
Dean of Student Services	24	21	87.5	118.3	18.8
President	22	16	72.8	130.3	28.4
Composite	70	59	84.3	123.3	23.7

^aDoes not include one blank questionnaire and one envelope returned empty.

^bDogmatism score.

scores were partitioned as high, defined as greater than 125, or low, defined as less than 126. This method of partitioning of dogmatism scores will be followed throughout other portions of this dissertation unless otherwise noted, as will the use of chi-square values corresponding to probabilities for chance occurrence of less than 0.10 in the determination of significance. No significant relationship between age and dogmatism appears to exist (see Table 2).

Sibling Relationships

Comparisons were drawn between high or low dogmatism scores and number of male siblings, according to whether the subject reported no male sibling or one or more male siblings. Similar treatment was accorded to the reported number of female siblings, reported number of older male siblings, and reported number of older female siblings. These data appear as Tables 3, 4, 5, and 6, respectively. Once again, no significant relationships were established.

Parental Occupation

Due to the low frequency of subjects reporting maternal occupations in categories other than that of housewife, it was decided to compare dogmatism scores for only two groups, Housewife and Other. These comparisons appear as Table 7. In a similar manner, paternal occupations were partitioned as either professional or nonprofessional. These comparisons appear as Table 8. Although the χ^2 value of 1.8621 determined for maternal occupation versus dogmatism is nearly significant, no clear-cut relationship between parental occupation and dogmatism appears to exist.

Table 3
Number of Male Siblings Versus Dogmatism Score

Number	Deans of				Deans of				Deans of				Deans of			
	Instruction		Student Services		Presidents		Composite		Instruction		Student Services		Presidents		Composite	
	$\chi^2 = 0.4821, df^a = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.0248, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.3254, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.1872, df = 1$									
	f ^b Low	f High	f Low	f High	f Low	f High	f Low	f High	f Low	f High	f Low	f High	f Low	f High	f Low	f High
0	3	5	5	3	1	1	9	9	3	5	5	3	1	1	9	9
1 or more	8	6	9	4	6	8	23	18	8	6	9	4	6	8	23	18

^adegrees of freedom

^bfrequency

Table 4

Number of Female Siblings Versus Dogmatism Score

Number	Deans of				Composite			
	Instruction		Student Services		Presidents		Composite	
	f ^b Low	f High	f Low	f High	f Low	f High	f Low	f High
0	5	6	5	2	1	2	11	10
1 or more	6	5	9	5	6	7	21	17
$\chi^2 = 0.0, df = 1$ $\chi^2 = 0.0265, df = 1$ $\chi^2 = 0.2611, df = 1$ $\chi^2 = 0.0451, df = 1$								

^adegrees of freedom

^bfrequency

Table 5

Number of Older Male Siblings Versus Dogmatism Score

Number	Deans of				Deans of				Deans of				Deans of				Deans of			
	Instruction		Student Services		Presidents		Composite		Instruction		Student Services		Presidents		Composite		Instruction		Student Services	
	$\chi^2 = 0.5332, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.2394, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 2.1324, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.6798, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.5332, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.2394, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 2.1324, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.6798, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.5332, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.2394, df = 1$	
	fb	Low	f	High	f	Low	f	High	f	Low	f	High	f	Low	f	High	f	Low	f	High
0	6		9		9		3		5		2		20		14		20		14	
1 or more	5		2		5		4		2		7		12		13		12		13	

a degrees of freedom

b frequency

Table 6

Number of Older Female Siblings Versus Dogmatism Score

Number	Deans of Instruction		Deans of Student Services		Presidents		Composite	
	f ^b Low	f High	f Low	f High	f Low	f High	f Low	f High
	$\chi^2 = 0.0, \text{ dfa} = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.0247, \text{ df} = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.1152, \text{ df} = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.4046, \text{ df} = 1$	
0	8	7	8	5	4	7	20	19
1 or more	3	4	6	2	3	2	12	8

^adegrees of freedom

^b frequency

Table 7

Maternal Occupation Versus Dogmatism Score

(Composite Only)

$$\chi^2 = 1.8621, df^a = 1$$

Occupation	f ^b Low	f High
Housewife	24	24
Other	8	3

^adegrees of freedom^bfrequency

Table 8

Paternal Occupation Versus Dogmatism Score

Occupation	Deans of				Deans of				Deans of			
	Instruction		Student Services		Presidents		Composite		Instruction		Student Services	
	$\chi^2 = 0.0$, $df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.5962$, $df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.0165$, $df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.0199$, $df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.0$, $df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.5962$, $df = 1$	
	f ^b Low	f High	f Low	f High	f Low	f High	f Low	f High	f Low	f High	f Low	f High
Professional	4	7	8	2	2	4	14	13	4	7	8	2
Nonprofessional	5	6	6	5	5	5	16	16	5	6	6	5

^adegrees of freedom

^bfrequency

Parental Education

Both paternal and maternal educational backgrounds were partitioned according to whether or not secondary school had been completed. These data appear as Tables 9 and 10, respectively.

The χ^2 values of 3.0084 and 7.2940 determined for the relationship between paternal education and dogmatism for deans of instruction and deans of student services respectively indicate a significant relationship. However, when combined these strong relationships offset each other; in the light of this and the fact that no significant relationship exists for presidents it is suggested that these apparent relationships be dismissed as spurious. Once again, no consistent relationship has been established.

Subject's Undergraduate Major

Field

In order to draw comparisons between educational backgrounds relative to dogmatism scores it was necessary to group academic disciplines. Four groups were used as follows: Group 1, Social Sciences; Group 2, Education; Group 3, Science and Engineering; and Group 4, Arts, Humanities, and Languages. Each group was then compared with the aggregate of all other groups, after which pairs of groups were compared with other pairs of groups. These comparisons appear as Appendix F. While no consistent significant relationship appears to exist in any of the positional categories, the composite of all administrators exhibits a significant relationship between undergraduate degrees in social sciences, arts, humanities, or languages and low dogmatism scores and between degrees in education,

Table 9

Paternal Education Versus Dogmatism Score

Education	Deans of				Deans of				Deans of				Deans of			
	Instruction		Student Services		Presidents		Composite		Instruction		Student Services		Presidents		Composite	
	f ^d	Low	f	High	f	Low	f	High	f	Low	f	High	f	Low	f	High
Less than high school																
graduate	9		4		2		6		2		4		4		13	14
High school																
graduate	2		7		12		1		5		5		5		19	13

$$\chi^2 = 3.0084^a, df^b = 1 \quad \chi^2 = 7.2940^c, df = 1 \quad \chi^2 = 0.0167, df = 1 \quad \chi^2 = 0.7434, df = 1$$

^a.10 > p > .05

^bdegrees of freedom

^c.01 > p > .001

^dfrequency

Table 10

Maternal Education Versus Dogmatism Score

Education	Deans of				Composite			
	Instruction	Student Services	Presidents		Instruction	Student Services	Presidents	
	$\chi^2 = 4.5832^a$, $df^b = 1$	$\chi^2 = 0.0$, $df = 1$	$\chi^2 = 0.1152$, $df = 1$	$\chi^2 = 2.3271$, $df = 1$				
	f ^c Low f High	f Low f High	f Low f High	f Low f High	f Low f High	f Low f High	f Low f High	f Low f High
Less than								
high school								
graduate	9 3	6 3	2 3	17 9				
High school								
graduate	2 8	8 4	5 6	15 18				

^a .05 > \underline{p} > .02^b degrees of freedom^c frequency

sciences, or engineering and high dogmatism scores.

Subject's Masters Degree Field

Data in this area was treated in a manner similar to that used with undergraduate major fields, and appear as Appendix G. No significant relationships were established.

Subject's Doctoral Field

In order to treat the area of subject's doctoral field in an appropriate manner, it was necessary to partition according to a method slightly different from that which was used in treating bachelors and masters degree fields. This was accomplished through noting the distinction between the Doctor of Philosophy and Doctor of Education degrees, together with the addition of a fifth group comprised of professional degrees such as the Juris Doctorate. Appendix H constitutes a series of comparisons between individual field categories and groups of categories and between possible combinations of those categories. The composite of all administrators indicates a significant relationship between degrees in education and low dogmatism scores and between degrees in sciences, engineering, or the professions and higher dogmatism scores.

Subject's Undergraduate Grade

Average

Using the standard A-B-C-letter-grade system, based on the assumption that no institution would confer a degree to anyone with a cumulative grade average of less than "C," comparisons were drawn between respondents reporting each grade and their counterparts comprising the remainder of each category. These comparisons appear

as Appendix I. No significant relationship was determined.

Subject's Military Service

In order to determine the possible existence of relationships between dogmatism and military service or lack thereof, respondents were classified either as having served in the military, regardless of branch or length of service, or as having not served. Table 11 presents these comparisons, which exhibit no significant relationship.

Subject's Military Rank

Those subjects reporting military service were grouped relative to enlisted or officer status. In those instances where a subject reported service in both categories, he was treated as an officer only. Table 12 indicates the comparisons which were then drawn within each job category between high and low dogmatism respondents relative to military rank. No significant relationships appear to exist.

Subject's Religious Affiliation

Due to the comparatively small number of subjects and the diversity of Protestant affiliations reported, comparisons were drawn only between Roman Catholics and Protestants, and appear as Table 13. No significant relationship was determined. Two Deans of Instruction and one Dean of Student Services reported having no religious affiliation and were not included in these comparisons. Table 14 provides comparisons between reports of strong, casual, or nominal affiliation among Protestants relative to high or low dogmatism. These comparisons provide evidence that Protestant administrators who perceive themselves as possessing strong religious affiliation tend to

Table 11

Subject's Military Service Versus Dogmatism Score

Group	Deans of				Deans of				Composite							
	Instruction		Student Services		Presidents		Composite									
	f ^b	Low	f	High	f	Low	f	High	f	Low	f	High				
	$\chi^2 = 1.7812, df = 1$				$\chi^2 = 0.0325, df = 1$				$\chi^2 = 0.0584, df = 1$				$\chi^2 = 0.1326, df = 1$			
Nonmilitary	1	5	4	1	2	1	1	7	7	25	7	20				
Military	10	6	10	6	5	8	8	25	25	7	7	20				

^adegrees of freedom^bfrequency

Table 12

Subject's Military Rank Versus Dogmatism Score

Group	Deans of Instruction		Deans of Student Services		Presidents		Composite	
	f ^b	Low	f	High	f	Low	f	High
	$\chi^2 = 0.2459, df^a = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.3124, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.2191, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.2386, df = 1$	
Enlisted	9	4	5	4	1	2	15	10
Officer	1	2	5	1	4	6	10	9

^adegrees of freedom^bfrequency

Table 13

Subject's Religious Affiliation Versus Dogmatism Score

Group	Deans of		Deans of		Deans of		Deans of		Composite
	Instruction		Student Services		Presidents		Presidents		
	f ^b Low	f High	f Low	f High	f Low	f High	f Low	f High	
	$\chi^2 = 0.5554, df^a = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.0964, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.1143, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.5955, df = 1$		
Protestant	8	10	12	6	6	9	26	25	
Roman									
Catholic	2	0	1	1	1	0	4	1	

^adegrees of freedom

^bfrequency

Table 14

Subject's Perceived Strength of Religious
Affiliation Versus Dogmatism Score

Strength	Deans of				Composite			
	Instruction		Student Services		Presidents		Composite	
	$\chi^2 = 1.3780, df^a = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.0278, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.5467, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 4.4485, df = 1^b$	
	f ^c Low	f High	f Low	f High	f Low	f High	f Low	f High
Strong	1	5	4	3	2	6	7	14
Casual and								
nominal	7	5	8	3	4	3	19	11

^adegrees of freedom

^b.05 > p > .02

^cfrequency

exhibit high dogmatism, while those who perceive themselves to be only casually or nominally affiliated tend to exhibit low dogmatism. A similar comparison between Protestants who reported being raised in that religious group and those who reported being converted to that group appears as Table 15, and indicates no apparent significant relationship.

Subject's Position

Comparisons between the three position categories relative to high or low dogmatism appear as Table 16. Further partitioning was accomplished through dividing each group according to dogmatism scores greater than 99 or less than 100 and greater than 149 or less than 150, and appears as Tables 17 and 18, respectively. Although the Tables 16 and 18 present no significant relationship, Table 17 appears to indicate a strong tendency on the part of deans to exhibit dogmatism scores less than 150, while no similar clear-cut tendency exists for presidents.

Table 15

Subject's Reported Means of Religious
Affiliation Versus Dogmatism Score

	Deans of					
	Instruction		Student Services		Presidents	
	$\chi^2 = 0.1430, df^a = 1$		$\chi^2 = 1.4317, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.0, df = 1$	
	f High		f Low		f High	
Means	f^b Low	f High	f Low	f High	f Low	f High
Raised	5	6	9	2	4	6
Convert	3	4	3	4	2	3

^adegrees of freedom

^bfrequency

Table 16

Subject's Position Versus Dogmatism Score

		$\chi^2 = 0.1450, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 1.9428, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 1.2260, df = 1$	
Position		fb		f		f	
		Low	High	Low	High	Low	High
Presidents		7	9	7	9		
Deans of Instruction		11	11			11	11
Deans of Student Services				14	7	14	7
						45	

^adegrees of freedom

^bfrequency

Table 17

Subject's Dogmatism Score Versus Position

$\chi^2 = 4.3881, df = 1^b$				$\chi^2 = 6.0071, df = 1^c$				$\chi^2 = 0.0015, df = 1$			
Score	f^d Deans of f Presi-			f Deans of Student f Presi-			f Deans of Student Services			f Deans of Instruction	
	Instruction	dents		Services	dents		Services	dents		Instruction	
149	20	9		20	9		20	20		20	
150	2	7		1	7		1	1		2	

^adegrees of freedom

^b.05 > p > .02

^c.02 > p > .01

^dfrequency

Table 18

Subject's Dogmatism Score Versus Position

$\chi^2 = 0.2809, df^a = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.0008, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.3423, df = 1$	
f ^b Deans of Instruc- tion	f Presi- dents	f Deans of Student Services		f Deans of Instruc- tion	
		f Presi- dents		Student Services	
99	15	13	16	13	15
100	7	3	5	3	7

^adegrees of freedom

^bfrequency

Chapter 4

Conclusions and Recommendations

Within this chapter will appear a series of conclusions written within the context of the experimental hypotheses stated in Chapter 1 and restated in Chapter 3, a brief general summary of those conclusions, and recommendations for additional research. It must be stressed that in no way is any attempt being made to suggest direct cause-effect relationships between socioeconomic factors and degree of open- or closed-mindedness exhibited by administrators in the Virginia Community College System.

Conclusions

In order to attempt to draw conclusions from the data gathered in this study, it is necessary to review the experimental hypotheses stipulated in Chapter 1. These hypotheses were as follows:

- a. the degree of open- or closed-mindedness demonstrated by upper echelon administrators in the Virginia Community College System is not related to various socioeconomic and educational factors,
- b. upper echelon administrators in the Virginia Community College System do not exhibit a generally closed-minded attitude,
- c. presidents in that system do not exhibit a greater degree of closed-mindedness than either deans of instruction or deans of student services, and
- d. deans of instruction do not exhibit a greater degree of closed-mindedness than deans of student services.

Hypothesis I

Examination of the data presented in Tables 2 through 18 and Appendices E through I is generally supportive of the primary hypothesis. Based on the establishment of chi-square values corresponding to probabilities for chance occurrence of less than .10 as indicative of significance, the only socioeconomic variables examined in this study which appear to be related to dogmatism are those discussed in the following paragraphs.

Undergraduate major. Deans of student services with baccalaureate degrees in education appear to have a tendency toward higher dogmatism scores than those with degrees in other fields. The composite of all administrators appears to exhibit a relationship between low dogmatism scores and degrees in social sciences or arts, humanities, and languages, and between high dogmatism scores and degrees in education, the sciences, or engineering.

Doctoral field. The composite of all subjects possessing the doctorate demonstrates significant tendencies toward lower dogmatism scores on the part of those with educational or social science degrees. Higher scores are tended toward by those with degrees in the sciences and professions.

Strength of religious affiliation. The composite of all Protestant administrators exhibits a significant tendency toward higher scores on the part of those who perceive themselves to be strong in their affiliation and toward lower scores on the part of those reporting casual or nominal affiliation.

Position. At the upper extreme of the dogmatism scale, i.e.,

above 149, both deans of instruction and deans of student services tend strongly to have dogmatism scores under 150, while presidents may fall either above 149 or below 150 with nearly equal probability. At the lower extreme of the scale, i.e., above 99 or below 100, no significant relationship exists.

Hypothesis II

In light of the mean dogmatism scores of 123.0, 118.3, 130.3, and 123.3 determined for deans of instruction, deans of student services, presidents, and composite administrators, respectively, together with respective standard deviations of 21.7, 18.8, 28.4, and 23.7, the hypothesis that upper-echelon administrators in the Virginia Community College System do not exhibit a generally closed-minded attitude is supported.

Hypotheses III and IV

While the dogmatism scores noted in the preceding paragraph would suggest a lack of support for either of these hypotheses, i.e., that presidents do not tend to be more closed-minded than deans of instruction and that deans of instruction do not tend to be more closed-minded than deans of students, the large standard deviations also reported would tend to support those hypotheses. However, the significant chi-square values reported in Table 17 relative to tendency toward extremely high dogmatism scores on the part of presidents would tend to suggest that presidents tend to exhibit higher dogmatism scores than either deans of instruction or deans of student services.

Summary

The data gathered in this study generally indicate little

relationship between the biographical variables examined and the degree of dogmatism exhibited by upper echelon administrators in the Virginia Community College System. However, certain of those variables do appear to be related to dogmatism. They are:

undergraduate major;

doctoral field;

perceived strength of religious affiliation, Protestants; and position held.

Upper echelon administrators in the Virginia Community College System do not exhibit a generally closed-minded attitude. In fact, in view of Rokeach's (1960, pp. 103-104) use of mean dogmatism scores of 157.2 and 101.1 for high and low dogmatism, it would be difficult to suggest that administrators in the Virginia Community College System could be classified as either high or low in dogmatism, and hence, either extremely open-minded or closed-minded.

Finally, there is no significant difference between the general degree of closed-mindedness exhibited by upper echelon administrators in the Virginia Community College System. However, individuals occupying the presidency of institutions in that system do tend to exhibit dogmatism scores above 149 more consistently than those individuals who function as dean of instruction or dean of student services.

Recommendations for Future

Research

Criticism of research projects is, in general, not difficult. Improvement of experimental methodology, on the other hand, is

frequently somewhat more difficult. It is the intent of the ensuing comments to attempt to accomplish both, i.e., criticism and improvement.

At the time at which this research was performed, the Virginia Community College System was still in a relatively unstable condition. This instability was due, not to organizational difficulties, but rather to the relative youth of the system and to the fact that the entire system had not at that time, 1972, been completed. Therefore, it can be suggested that staffs of the various institutions comprising the System had also not achieved a condition of stability. Many of the subjects of this research no longer occupy the positions which they held at the time of this research; in fact, many of them have moved either laterally or vertically within the System, to be replaced either by personnel from other positions within the System or by administrators whose origins lay outside it.

This is not intended to suggest that such instability is inherently wrong; rather, such a condition is probably healthy. What is suggested, however, is that this same study, or one similar to it, might well benefit from readministration, as a result of an alteration of the attitude of those participating in this research and as a result of the increased population size resulting from systemic growth.

In order to draw conclusions relative to the manner in which administrative staff members are affected by a system of institutions of higher education or in which they exert an influence on that

system, it would appear advantageous if comparisons could be drawn between a variety of systems. For example, it is suggested that comparisons be drawn between the Virginia Community College System and other systems both similar and dissimilar in structure.

The restriction of this study to upper echelon administrators within the colleges comprising the Virginia Community College System eliminated three other groups which might well have been important from the standpoint of comparison, i.e., lower echelon administrators, such as division chairmen, faculty members, and the staff of the Department of Community Colleges. Inclusion of these potential subjects in subsequent research would provide information relative to the interrelationship between the backgrounds and attitudes of administrators and those of the faculty members serving under them as well as between those attitudes and backgrounds and those of members of the coordinative staff of the System.

Finally, insofar as the instrument used in this research is concerned, it is recommended that the biographical portion be reorganized in such a manner as to provide data in a form more adaptable to the use of correlational methodology. In addition, if possible, it would be advantageous to include questions of a more exacting nature, e.g., the specific nature of parental occupation, rather than simply an indication of general type, or an indication of exact age, rather than a range of ages.

Appendices

Appendix A
Attitudinal and Biographical Survey of
Upper Echelon Administrators in the
Virginia Community College System

A Doctoral Research Project
under the auspices of
The College of William and Mary
School of Education

Paul S. Hurd

1972

55

Part I: Opinionnaire

The following is a study of what the general public thinks and feels about a number of important social and personal questions. The best answer to each statement below is your personal opinion. We have tried to cover many different and opposing points of view; you may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about others; whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many people feel the same as you do.

Mark each statement in the left margin according to how much you agree or disagree with it. Please mark every one. Write +1, +2, +3, or -1, -2, or -3, depending on how you feel in each case.

+1: I agree a little.

+2: I agree on the whole.

+3: I agree very much.

-1: I disagree a little.

-2: I disagree on the whole.

-3: I disagree very much.

_____ 1. The United States and Russia have just about nothing in common.

_____ 2. The highest form of government is a democracy and the highest form of democracy is a government run by those who are most intelligent.

_____ 3. Even though freedom of speech for all groups is a worthwhile goal, it is unfortunately necessary to restrict the freedom of certain political groups.

- _____ 4. It is only natural that a person would have a much better acquaintance with ideas he believes in than with ideas he opposes.
- _____ 5. Man on his own is a helpless and miserable creature.
- _____ 6. Fundamentally, the world we live in is a pretty lonesome place.
- _____ 7. Most people just don't give a "damn" for others.
- _____ 8. I'd like it if I could find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems.
- _____ 9. It is only natural for a person to be rather fearful of the future.
- _____ 10. There is so much to be done and so little time to do it in.
- _____ 11. Once I get wound up in a heated discussion I just can't stop.
- _____ 12. In a discussion I often find it necessary to repeat myself several times to make sure I am being understood.
- _____ 13. In a heated discussion I generally become so absorbed in what I am going to say that I forget to listen to what others are saying.
- _____ 14. It is better to be a dead hero than to be a live coward.
- _____ 15. While I don't like to admit this even to myself, my secret ambition is to become a great man, like Einstein, or Beethoven, or Shakespeare.
- _____ 16. The main thing in life is for a person to want to do something important.

_____17. If given the chance I would do something of great benefit to the world.

_____18. In the history of mankind there have probably been just a handful of really great thinkers.

_____19. There are a number of people I have come to hate because of the things they stand for.

_____20. A man who does not believe in some great cause has not really lived.

_____21. It is only when a person devotes himself to an ideal or cause that life becomes meaningful.

_____22. Of all the different philosophies which exist in this world there is probably only one which is correct.

_____23. A person who gets enthusiastic about too many causes is likely to be pretty "wishy-washy" sort of person.

_____24. To compromise with our political opponents is dangerous because it usually leads to the betrayal of our own side.

_____25. When it comes to differences of opinion in religion we must be careful not to compromise with those who believe differently from the way we do.

_____26. In times like these, a person must be pretty selfish if he considers primarily his own happiness.

_____27. The worst crime a person could commit is to attack publicly the people who believe in the same thing he does.

_____28. In times like these it is often necessary to be more on guard against ideas put out by people or groups in one's own camp than by those in the opposing camp.

_____29. A group which tolerates too much difference of opinion among its own members cannot exist for long.

_____30. There are two kinds of people in this world: those who are for the truth and those who are against the truth.

_____31. My blood boils whenever a person stubbornly refuses to admit he's wrong.

_____32. A person who thinks primarily of his own happiness is beneath contempt.

_____33. Most of the ideas which get printed nowadays aren't worth the paper they are printed on.

_____34. In this complicated world of ours the only way we can know what's going on is to rely on leaders or experts who can be trusted.

_____35. It is often desirable to reserve judgment about what's going on until one has had a chance to hear the opinions of those one respects.

_____36. In the long run the best way to live is to pick friends and associates whose tastes and beliefs are the same as one's own.

_____37. The present is all too often full of unhappiness. It is only the future that counts.

_____38. If a man is to accomplish his mission in life it is sometimes necessary to gamble "all or nothing at all."

_____39. Unfortunately, a good many people with whom I have discussed important social and moral problems don't really understand what's going on.

_____40. Most people just don't know what's good for them.

Part II: Biographical Inventory

Please provide the information requested below by responding to each question in the appropriate manner, as indicated with that question.

1. Socioeconomic

a. State or country of birth: _____

b. State or country of parents' birth:

Father _____

Mother _____

c. Your present age: (Circle the appropriate response)

25 to 29; 30 to 34; 35 to 39; 40 to 44; 45 to 49; 50 to 54; 55 to 59;
60 or older.

d. Number of male siblings: (Circle the appropriate response)

0 1 2 3 4 5 or more

e. Number of female siblings: 0 1 2 3 4 5 or more

f. Number of older male siblings: 0 1 2 3 4 5 or
more

g. Number of older female siblings: 0 1 2 3 4 5 or
more

h. Indicate your parents' occupations by placing "M" in the space representing that of your Mother and "F" in the space appropriate to your Father.

___ professional: ___ educational, ___ noneducational (specify)

___ skilled worker

___ housewife

___ career military: ___ enlisted, ___ officer

___ laborer

i. Indicate your parents' level of educational attainment by placing "M" in the space representing that of your Mother and "F" in the space appropriate to that of your Father.

___ eighth grade or less

___ ninth through eleventh grade

___ high school graduate

___ one through two years of college

___ three through four years of college, but without the baccalaureate degree

___ baccalaureate degree

___ some graduate work

___ masters degree or equivalent

___ post-masters work

___ Ph.D. or equivalent academic degree

___ M.D., D.D.S., J.D., or equivalent professional degree

2. Occupational and Educational

j. Indicate the field of your undergraduate degree: _____

k. Circle the number which most closely approximates the number of years which elapsed between the receipt of your baccalaureate degree and receipt of your next degree: 1 2 3 4 more than 5

l. Indicate the field in which you received each of your graduate degrees by writing the name of that field in the appropriate space:

masters degree _____

specialist degree _____

Ph.D. _____

Ed.D. _____

other (specify degree) _____

m. As a child, did you attend a public ____, parochial ____, or other private ____ elementary school for the greatest period of time?

n. Did you attend a public ____, parochial ____, or other private ____ high school?

o. Circle the response which most closely represents the fraction of your expenses which you supplied by working as an undergraduate student: 1/4 1/2 3/4 all

p. Indicate your marital status as an undergraduate by checking the appropriate response below:

____ not married during undergraduate period

____ married prior to first year

____ married during first year

____ married during second year

____ married during third year

____ married during fourth year

q. Circle the letter grade which most closely approximates your undergraduate average: A B C

r. Place a check in the space representing the branch of military service in which you served:

____ Army

____ Navy

____ Marine Corps

____ Air Force or Army Air Corps

☐ Coast Guard

☐ Did not serve in military

s. Did you serve as an enlisted man ☐ or officer ☐?

t. If you have previously held a position in any of the following fields, indicate the number of years that you held that position in the space adjacent to it:

☐ teaching at the elementary or secondary level

☐ teaching at the college level

☐ administration at the elementary or secondary level

☐ administration at the college level

☐ industrial or commercial management, including research, supervision, sales, et cetera

☐ industrial or commercial nonmanagement

3. Religious

u. Place a check in the space adjacent to your religious affiliation:

☐ Roman Catholic

☐ Jewish

☐ none

☐ Protestant--specify: _____

☐ other--specify: _____

v. Indicate with a check whether you consider yourself to be a strong ☐, casual ☐, or nominal ☐ member of that group.

w. Were you raised as a member of that group ☐ or were you a convert from another group ☐?

4. Current Position

x. Indicate your current title by placing a check in the space adjacent to it:

☐ President

☐ Provost of a campus

☐ Dean of Instruction

☐ Dean of Student Services

Appendix B

Covering Letter of Questionnaire

Tidewater Community College

Portsmouth, Virginia 23703

Enclosed herewith you will find a questionnaire pertaining to you, both as an individual and as a community college administrator, and a memorandum from Dr. S. A. Burnette, Vice-Chancellor of the Virginia Community College System, supporting this research effort. A similar package is being mailed to each President, Provost, Dean of Instruction, and Dean of Student Services in the System in order to obtain information relative to attitudes and backgrounds prevalent in the people occupying these positions.

Although I know from personal experience that you are perennially besieged with such requests, it is hoped that you will complete the instrument and return it promptly, using the enclosed return envelope. Please do not indicate your name on either the instrument or the return envelope, in order that your anonymity may be protected.

66

Thank you for your cooperation in this project.

Sincerely,

/s/ Paul S. Hurd

Paul S. Hurd, Chairman

Division of Sciences and Technologies

PSH:bjg

Enclosures

Appendix C

Supporting Memorandum from Dr. S. A. Burnette

Virginia Department of
Community Colleges

To: Community College Presidents
Provosts
Deans of Instruction
Deans of Student Services

From: S. A. Burnette

Date: June 14, 1972

Subject: Study in Administration of Higher Education

Mr. Paul S. Hurd, Division Chairman at the Frederick Campus of the Tidewater Community College, will be communicating with each of you in the near future to request that you provide information related to his doctoral research at the College of William and Mary. Dr. Hamel and I have discussed Mr. Hurd's project and request that you assist him as your schedules and responsibilities permit.

SAB/mcb

cc: Dr. Fred A. Snyder

Appendix D

Biographical Areas Examined for Potential
Relationship with Dogmatism

Biographical factor	Deans of		Deans of	
	Instruction	Students	Presidents	Aggregate
Age	x	x	x	x
Number of female siblings	x	x	x	x
Number of male siblings	x	x	x	x
Number of older female siblings	x	x	x	x
Number of older male siblings	x	x	x	x
Mother's occupation				x
Father's occupation	x	x	x	x
Mother's education	x	x	x	x
Father's education	x	x	x	x
Undergraduate major	x	x	x	x
Masters degree field	x	x	x	x
Doctoral field	x	x	x	x
Undergraduate grades	x	x	x	x

Military history	x	x	x	x
Military rank	x	x	x	x
Religious affiliation	x	x	x	x
Strength of religious affiliation	x	x	x	x
Origin of religious affiliation	x	x	x	x
Current position	x	x	x	x

Appendix E
Biographical Profiles

Factor	Position		
	Dean of Instruction	Dean of Students	President
Region of birth	Southeastern	Eastern- Southern	Southeastern or North Central
Region of father's birth	Southeastern	Eastern- Southern	Southeastern or North Central
Region of mother's birth	Southeastern	Eastern- Southern	Southeastern or North Central
Age (years)	39.95	40.33	44.81
Number of male siblings	1	1	2
Number of female siblings	1	1	2

Number of older

male siblings	0	0	1
---------------	---	---	---

Number of older

female siblings	0	0	1
-----------------	---	---	---

Father's

occupation	Professional or		
	skilled worker	Professional or	
		skilled worker	Professional or
			skilled worker

Mother's

occupation	Housewife	Housewife	Housewife
------------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Father's education

Less than			
Baccalaureate	Less than		
	Baccalaureate	Less than	
		Baccalaureate	

Mother's education

Less than			
Baccalaureate	Less than		
	Baccalaureate	Less than	
		Baccalaureate	

Occupational

experience

(years):

Elementary-

Secondary

teaching	1.7	3.0	3.4
----------	-----	-----	-----

College			
teaching	4.7	2.2	4.2
Elementary-			
Secondary			
administration	0.5	1.4	0.8
College			
administration	3.5	2.6	6.1
Industrial-			
commercial			
management	0.8	0.4	0.7
Industrial-			
commercial			
nonmanagement	0.8	0.6	0.1
Religious			
affiliation	Protestant	Protestant	Protestant
Strength of			
affiliation	Casual/strong	Casual/strong	Strong
Entry into			
affiliation,			
raised vs. convert	Raised	Raised	Raised
Undergraduate			
degree field	Social Science		
	or Engineering	Social Sciences	Science or
			Engineering

Interval

between

Baccalaureate and

next degree

(years)

3.14

3.62

3.51

Masters degree

field

Education,

Science or

Engineering

Education

Education

Doctoral field

Education

Education^a

Education

Elementary-

Secondary school,

public or private

Public

Public

Public

Proportion of

support provided

personally as

undergraduate

54.54

58.33

43.75

Undergraduate

marital status

Single

Single

Single

Undergraduate

grade average

B

B

B

Military service

Navy, Army, or

Marine Corps

Army or Navy

Army or Navy

Rank status

Enlisted

Enlisted

Officer

^a42.86% of Deans of Student Services reporting indicated no
doctorate.

Appendix F

Undergraduate Major Field Versus Dogmatism Score

Group	Deans of				Presidents				Composite	
	Instruction		Student Services		Presidents		Composite			
	f ^a Low	f High	f Low	f High	f Low	f High	f Low	f High		
1	4	3	8	3	2	1	14	7		
2 + 3 + 4	7	8	6	4	5	8	18	20		
	$\chi^2 = 0.0000, df^b = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.0236, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.0584, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 2.0292, df = 1$			
2	3	2	1	3	0	2	4	7		
1 + 3 + 4	8	9	13	4	7	7	28	20		
	$\chi^2 = 0.0000, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 3.8602, df = 1^c$		$\chi^2 = 0.3262, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 1.7401, df = 1$			
3	2	4	2	1	3	5	7	10		
1 + 2 + 4	9	7	12	6	4	4	25	17		
	$\chi^2 = 0.0000, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.0000, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.0000, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 1.6411, df = 1$			

4	2	2	3	0	2	1	7	3
1 + 2 + 3	9	9	11	7	5	8	25	24
	$\chi^2 = 0.0000$, df = 1	$\chi^2 = 0.4374$, df = 1	$\chi^2 = 0.0584$, df = 1	$\chi^2 = 0.5616$, df = 1				
1 + 2	7	4	7	5	2	3	18	14
3 + 4	5	6	5	4	5	6	14	13
	$\chi^2 = 0.1832$, df = 1	$\chi^2 = 0.1009$, df = 1	$\chi^2 = 0.1152$, df = 1	$\chi^2 = 0.1139$, df = 1				
1 + 4	6	5	11	3	4	2	21	17
2 + 3	5	6	3	4	3	7	11	10
	$\chi^2 = 0.0000$, df = 1	$\chi^2 = 1.3123$, df = 1	$\chi^2 = 0.8294$, df = 1	$\chi^2 = 0.0451$, df = 1				
1 + 3	6	7	10	4	5	6	21	10
2 + 4	5	4	4	3	2	3	11	17
	$\chi^2 = 0.0000$, df = 1	$\chi^2 = 1.3123$, df = 1	$\chi^2 = 0.1152$, df = 1	$\chi^2 = 4.7996$, df = 1 ^c				

^afrequency

^bdegrees of freedom

^c.05 > p > .02

Appendix G

Subject's Masters Degree Field Versus Dogmatism Score

Group	Deans of				Deans of				Composite			
	Instruction ^a		Student Services ^b		President ^c							
	f ^d Low	f High	f Low	f High	f Low	f High	f Low	f High	f Low	f High	f Low	f High
1	3	0			1		1		6		4	
2 + 3 + 4	8	10			5		5		25		22	
	$\chi^2 = 1.3440$, $df^e = 1$				$\chi^2 = 0.2163$, $df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.0126$, $df = 1$					
2	5	5			3		5		19		14	
1 + 3 + 4	6	5			3		4		12		12	
	$\chi^2 = 0.0834$, $df = 1$				$\chi^2 = 0.1003$, $df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.3213$, $df = 1$					
3	2	4			1		3		4		7	
1 + 2 + 4	9	6			5		6		27		19	
	$\chi^2 = 0.3864$, $df = 1$				$\chi^2 = 0.0140$, $df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 1.7845$, $df = 1$					

4	1	1	1	2	1
1 + 2 + 3	10	9	9	29	25
	$\chi^2 = 0.1952$, df = 1		$\chi^2 = 0.0445$, df = 1	$\chi^2 = 0.0243$, df = 1	
1 + 2	8	5	6	25	18
3 + 4	3	5	3	6	8
	$\chi^2 = 0.3857$, df = 1		$\chi^2 = 0.0000$, df = 1	$\chi^2 = 0.9942$, df = 1	
1 + 4	4	1	1	8	5
2 + 3	7	9	8	23	21
	$\chi^2 = 0.8164$, df = 1		$\chi^2 = 0.1562$, df = 1	$\chi^2 = 0.3471$, df = 1	
1 + 3	5	4	4	10	11
2 + 4	6	6	5	21	15
	$\chi^2 = 0.0634$, df = 1		$\chi^2 = 0.0113$, df = 1	$\chi^2 = 0.6135$, df = 1	

1	2	3
2 + 3	12	4
	$\chi^2 = 0.8198$, df = 1	
2	11	4
1 + 3	3	3
	$\chi^2 = 0.2625$, df = 1	

3	1	0
1 + 2	13	7

$\chi^2 = 0.1307, df = 1$

^aOne subject reported no masters degree field.

^bNo subjects reported masters degrees in group 4.

^cOne subject reported no masters degree.

dfrequency

edegrees of freedom

Appendix H

Subject's Doctoral Field Versus Dogmatism Score

Group	Deans of				Presidents ^c				Composite ^d	
	Instruction ^a		Student Services ^b		f Low		f High		f Low	f High
	f ^e Low	f High	f Low	f High	f Low	f High				
1	1	1							1	1
2 + 3 + 5	10	10							31	26
	$\chi^2 = 0.0000, df^f = 1$								$\chi^2 = 0.3592, df = 1$	
2 (Education)	5	4	7	1	4		4		16	9
Remainder	6	7	7	6	3		5		16	18
	$\chi^2 = 0.0000, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 1.2367, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.0000, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 1.6657, df = 1$			
2 (Philosophy)	3	1	3	1	2		3		8	5
Remainder	8	10	11	6	5		6		24	22
	$\chi^2 = 0.3054, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.0382, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.1586, df = 1$		$\chi^2 = 0.3579, df = 1$			

3	0	1	1	2
1 + 2 + 5	11	10	25	
	$\chi^2 = 0.0000$, df = 1		$\chi^2 = 0.0226$, df = 1	
5	2	4	10	
1 + 2 + 3	9	7	17	
	$\chi^2 = 0.2290$, df = 1		$\chi^2 = 2.4777$, df = 1	
2	8	5	14	
1 + 3 + 5	3	6	13	
	$\chi^2 = 0.3076$, df = 1		$\chi^2 = 3.4227^g$, df = 1	
1 + 2	9	6	15	80
3 + 5	2	5	12	
	$\chi^2 = 0.8381$, df = 1		$\chi^2 = 3.4164^g$, df = 1	
1 + 3	1	2	3	
2 + 5	10	9	24	
	$\chi^2 = 0.0000$, df = 1		$\chi^2 = 0.0395$, df = 1	
1 + 5	3	5	11	
2 + 3	8	6	16	
	$\chi^2 = 0.1964$, df = 1		$\chi^2 = 2.4583$, df = 1	

2

5

10

4

2

5

$\chi^2 = 1.9687, df = 1$

3	1	1
2 + 5	6	8
	$\chi^2 = 0.3262$, df =	1
5	0	1
2 + 3	7	8
	$\chi^2 = 0.0167$, df =	1
2	6	7
3 + 5	1	2
	$\chi^2 = 0.0584$, df =	1

^aNo subjects reported doctorates in group 4.

^bNo subjects reported doctorates in groups 1, 3, or 4

c No subjects reported doctorates in groups 1 or 4.

^dNo subjects reported doctorates in group 4.

$$e_{\text{frequency}}$$

f degrees of freedom

$$8.10 > \bar{p} > .05$$

Appendix I

Subject's Undergraduate Grade Average Versus Dogmatism Score

Deans of		Deans of		Student Services		Presidents		Composite	
Instruction									
f ^a Low	f High	f Low	f High	f Low	f High	f Low	f High	f Low	f High
A	2	1	1	2	0	1	3	4	
B + C	9	10	13	5	7	8	29	23	
$\chi^2 = 0.0000$, df ^b = 1		$\chi^2 = 0.4374$, df = 1		$\chi^2 = 0.0167$, df = 1		$\chi^2 = 0.0572$, df = 1			
B	8	7	6	4	6	5	20	16	
A + C	3	4	8	3	1	4	12	11	
$\chi^2 = 0.0000$, df = 1		$\chi^2 = 0.0236$, df = 1		$\chi^2 = 0.5647$, df = 1		$\chi^2 = 0.0644$, df = 1			

C	1	3	7	1	1	3	9	7
A + B	10	8	7	6	6	6	23	20
	$\chi^2 = 0.3000, df = 1$ $\chi^2 = 1.2367, df = 1$ $\chi^2 = 0.0845, df = 1$ $\chi^2 = 0.0356, df = 1$							

afrequency

bdegrees of freedom

References

References

- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N.
The authoritarian personality. New York: Harper & Row, 1950.
- Bhushan, L. I. Leadership preference as a function of authoritarianism
and intolerance of ambiguity. Psychologia: An International
Journal of Psychology in the Orient, 1970, 13(4), 217-222. (a)
- Bhushan, L. I. Personality factors and leadership preference.
Indian Psychological Review, 1970, 6(2), 125-126. (b)
- Blocker, C. E., Plummer, R. H., & Richardson, R. C., Jr. The two-year
college: A social synthesis. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey:
Prentice-Hall, 1955.
- Byrne, D. An introduction to personality. Englewood Cliffs, New
Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966. (a)
- Byrne, D. Parental antecedents of authoritarianism. In Byrne, D., &
Hamilton, M. L. (Eds.) Personality research. Englewood Cliffs,
New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966. (b)
- Carmichael, J. H. Origin and mobility of presidents. Junior College
Journal, 1969, 39(8), 30-32.
- Cavanaugh, J. D. Position sequences and career strategies of public
community junior college presidents. Unpublished doctoral
dissertation, University of Colorado, 1971.
- Clouser, R. A., & Hjelle, L. A. Relationship between locus of control
and dogmatism. Psychological Reports, 1970, 26(3), 1006.

- Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. Confronting identity. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972.
- Cronbach, L. J. Essentials of psychological testing. (3rd ed.) New York: Harper & Row, 1970.
- Cuffee, W. Personality rigidity and chronological age. Graduate Research in Education and Related Disciplines, 1970 5(2), 97-108.
- Dahl, E. W. Role perceptions and job satisfaction among lower and middle level junior college administrators. Journal of Educational Research, 1970, 21(2), 57-63.
- Dandes, H. M. Psychological health and teaching effectiveness. Journal of Teacher Education, 1966, 17, 301-306.
- Demerath, N. J., Stephens, R. W., & Taylor, R. R. Power, presidents, and professors. New York: Basic Books, 1967.
- Dressel, P. L., & Lehmann, I. J. The impact of higher education on student attitudes, values, and critical thinking abilities. In O. Milton, & E. J. Shoben, Jr. (Eds.), Learning and the professors. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1968.
- Duryea, E. D. The theory and practice of administration. In G. P. Burns (Ed.), Administrators in higher education, their functions and coordination. New York: Harper, 1962.
- Funk, C. D., & Carter, G. L. The relationship between dogmatism scores and performance ratings among adult educators. Adult Education Journal, 1971, 21(2), 46-55.
- Gabennesch, H., & Hunt, L. L. The relative accuracy of interpersonal perception of high and low authoritarians. Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 1971, 5(1), 43-48.

- Gordon, B. K. Dogmatism, philosophy, and leader behavior of school administrators. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1970.
- Gould, J. W. The academic deanship. Institute of Higher Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.
- Hamilton, D. L. A comparative study of five methods of assessing self-esteem, dominance, and dogmatism. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1971, 31(3), 441-452.
- Hemphill, J. K. Leadership behavior associated with the administrative reputation of college departments. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1955, 46(7), 385-401.
- Hungate, T. L. Management in higher education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.
- Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.
- Kilpatrick, D. G., Sutker, L. W., & Sutker, P. B. Dogmatism, religion, and religiousity, a review and re-evaluation. Psychological Reports, 1970, 26(1), 15-22.
- Korn, H. A., & Giddan, N. S. Scoring methods and construct validity of the dogmatism scale. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1964, 24(4), 867-874.
- Latta, W. M., & Hartung, A. B. The junior college dean: The man and the position. Junior College Journal, 1970, 41(1), 19-22.
- Lee, D. J., & Ehrlich, H. J. Beliefs about self and others: A test of the dogmatism theory. Psychological Reports, 1971, 28(3), 919-922.

- Likert, R. The human organization. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Long, C. D. Leader behavior as perceived by junior college professionals. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tulsa, 1971.
- McGregor, D. The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
- Masterson, T. Management functions. College and University Business, 1960, 28(2), 21.
- Mednick, M. T., & Mednick, S. A. Research in personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.
- Mikesell, R. H., & Tesser, A. Life history antecedents of authoritarianism: A quasi-longitudinal approach. Proceedings of the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 1971, 6(1), 369-370.
- Millett, J. D. The academic community: An essay on organization. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.
- Moore, G. R. A profile of southeastern presidents. Junior College Journal, 1971, 42(4), 16-18.
- Moreland, H. L. Measures of dogmatism of student personnel directors in selected colleges and universities. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Mississippi, 1971.
- Mouw, J. T. Effect of dogmatism on levels of cognitive processes. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1969, 60(5), 365-369.
- O'Banion, T., Thurston, A., & Gulden, J. Student personnel work: An emerging model. Junior College Journal, 1970, 41(3), 6-14.

Piters, R. E. An investigation of the relationship between dogmatism and communication in educational administrators. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Utah State University, 1971.

Plant, W. T., Telford, C. W., & Thomas, J. A. Some personality differences between dogmatic and non-dogmatic groups. Journal of Social Psychology, 1965, 67, 67-75.

Richardson, R. C., Jr. Needed: New directions in administration. Junior College Journal, 1970, 40(6), 16-22.

Rokeach, M. The open and closed mind. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Rokeach, M., & Fruchter, B. A factorial study of dogmatism and related concepts. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1956, 53, 356-360.

Simons, H. W., & Berkowitz, N. N. Rokeach's dogmatism scale and leftist bias. Speech Monthly, 1969, 36, 459-463.

Thornton, J. W., Jr. The community junior college. New York: Wiley, 1960.

Vacchiano, R. B., Strauss, P. B., & Hochman, L. The open and closed mind: A review of dogmatism. Psychological Bulletin, 1969, 71(4), 261-273.

Wees, W. R. Authoritarianism in education. Canadian Journal of Psychology, 1953, 10, 21-24.

Wilson, L. Academic administration: Its abuses and uses. AAUP Bulletin, 1955, 41(4), 686-687.

Wittmer, J., & Webster, G. B. The relationship between teaching experience and counselor trainee dogmatism. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1969, 16, 499-504.

Vita

Paul St. Clair Hurd

Date of Birth: December 11, 1936

Place of Birth: Benton Harbor, Michigan

Bachelor of Science, Metallurgical Engineering, Michigan Technological University, 1954-1959.

Master of Arts, Industrial Education, Western Michigan University, 1963-1965.

Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study, Administration of Higher Education, College of William and Mary, 1970-1971.

Doctor of Education, Administration of Higher Education, College of William and Mary, 1971-1973 (anticipated).

Abstract

This study was addressed to the determination of relationships between degree of dogmatism and biographical data for presidents, deans of instruction, and deans of student services in the Virginia Community College System. Data were gathered from 59 of the 70 individuals holding those positions in June of 1972. Dogmatism was measured by use of the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Form E), and biographical data were determined through an instrument developed for this research.

The data gathered provided general biographical profiles of the administrators surveyed, and indicated significant relationships between dogmatism and undergraduate major, doctoral field, perceived strength of religious affiliation, and position. In addition, it was concluded that administrators in the Virginia Community College System do not exhibit a generally closed-minded attitude.